

Remarks

Claims 1-39 remain pending in the Application.

Rejection under 102(e)

Claims 1, 4-6, 10, 12, 13, 15-20, 22-24, 32, 33, 36 and 39

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4-6, 10, 12, 13, 15-20, 22-24, 32, 33, 36 and 39 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Gonda et al. (6,662,221). Applicant has reviewed Gonda et al. and respectfully states that Gonda et al. do not anticipate the present invention for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully states that Claims 1, 22 and 36 include the feature “utilizing a communications device that does not itself have firewall capability that is required by the network to connect to the network.” Moreover, Claim 1 includes the features “ the data transferred by the communication device to be processed by said firewall on a first device.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Gonda et al. anticipates the feature of Claims 1, 22 and 36. Applicant understands Gonda et al. to teach configuration management in a network. Moreover, Applicant does not understand Gonda et al. to teach or illustrate a firewall for the various business partners connected to the corporate center via a service provider and/or public data network. Instead, Applicant understands Gonda et al. to teach the utilization of tunneling protocols e.g., placing one packet inside another packet, to create private data streams via a public network.

Therefore, Applicant does not understand Gonda to limit access to those devices within a firewall or to provide an enterprise-wide firewall. Moreover, Applicant does not understand Gonda et al. to anticipate the utilization of a communications device that does not itself have firewall capability that is required by the network to connect to the network (emphasis added). Moreover, Applicant

does not understand Gonda et al. to teach any method to overcome the limitations based on firewall requirements of the device accessing the network, but instead Gonda et al. to teach access to the network based on tunneling protocols, SSL connections, and the like, which do not offer any solutions other than rejection for a device not having the correct firewall status.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Gonda et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1, 22 and 36, and as such, Claims 1, 22 and 36 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Gonda et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 4-6, 10, 12, 13, 15-20 and 39 that are dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 1, and Claims 23-24 and 32-33 that are dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 22, and that Claims 4-6, 10, 12, 13, 15-20, 23-24, 32, 33 and 39 recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 4-6, 10, 12, 13, 15-20, 23-24, 32, 33 and 39 are allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Rejection under 103(a)

Claims 2, 8, 9, 11, 21, 25 and 34

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 2, 8, 9, 11, 21, 25 and 34 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonda et al. in view of Gleichauf et al. (6,324,656). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Gonda et al. in view of Gleichauf et al. for the following rationale.

With respect to Claims 2, 8, 9, 11 and 21, Applicant respectfully points out that Claims 2, 8, 9, 11 and 21 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 1 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 2, 8, 9, 11 and 21 are allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

With respect to Claims 25 and 34, Applicant respectfully points out that Claims 25 and 34 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 22 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 25 and 34 are allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Claims 3 and 7

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3 and 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonda et al. in view of Servi (5,278,904). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Gonda et al. in view of Servi for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claims 3 and 7 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 1 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 3 and 7 are allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Claim 14

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 14 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonda et al. in view of Dempsey et al. (5,826,048). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Gonda et al. in view of Dempsey et al. for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 14 depends from the allowable Independent Claim 1 and recites further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 14 is allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Claim 26

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonda et al. and Gleichauf et al. in view of Watson et al. (5,475,839). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Gonda et al. and Gleichauf et al. in view of Watson et al. for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 26 depends from the allowable Independent Claim 22 and recites further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 26 is allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Claims 27 and 28

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 27 and 28 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonda et al. and Gleichauf et al. in view of Fisher (5,475,826). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Gonda et al. and Gleichauf et al. in view of Fisher for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claims 27 and 28 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 22 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 27 and 28 are allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Claims 29, 30 and 35

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 29, 30 and 35 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonda et al. and Gleichauf et al. in view of Daniel (6,324,656). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Gonda et al. and Gleichauf et al. in view of Daniel for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claims 29, 30 and 35 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 22 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 29, 30 and 35 are allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Claim 31

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 31 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonda et al. and Gleichauf et al. in view of Uceda-Sosa et al. (6,494,840). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Gonda et al. and Gleichauf et al. in view of Uceda-Sosa et al. for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 31 depends from the allowable Independent Claim 22 and recites further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 31 is allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Claim 37

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 37 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonda et al. in view of Fischer (5,475,826). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Gonda et al. in view of Fischer for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 37 depends from the allowable Independent Claim 36 and recites further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 37 is allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Claim 38

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 38 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonda et al. in view of Servi (5,278,904). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Gonda et al. in view of Servi for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 38 depends from the allowable Independent Claim 36 and recites further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 38 is allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-39.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 1/24/05

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John P. Wagner, Jr.", is written over a horizontal line.

John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060